	I and the second	
1	Gary M. Hoffman (Pro Hac Vice) Kenneth W. Brothers (Pro Hac Vice) DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY, LLP 2101 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037-1526 Phone (202) 785-9700 Fax (202) 887-0689	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	Edward A. Meilman (Pro Hac Vice)	
7	DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY, LLP	
8	1177 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036-2714 Phone (212) 835-1400 Fax (212) 997-9880	
9		
10		
11	Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008 ALTSHULER, BERZON, NUSSBAUM, RUBIN & DEMAIN 177 Post Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, California 94108 Phone (415) 421-7151 Fax (415) 362-8064	
12		
13		
14		
15	Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
16		
17		
18		
19	RICOH COMPANY LTD.,)
20	Plaintiff,) Case No.: C-03-4669-MJJ (EMC)
21	vs.) AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,) Defendant)	 RICOH'S REPLY TO ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT AEROFLEX COLORADO SPRINGS, INC. TO AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
- 1	I a company and	

Case No.: C-03-4669-MJJ (EMC)

RICOH'S REPLY TO ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS OF DEFENDANT AEROFLEX COLORADO SPRINGS, INC. TO

AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Ricoh Company, Ltd. ("Ricoh") for its Reply to the Answer and Counterclaims of Defendant Aeroflex Colorado Springs, Inc. To Amended Complaint For Patent Infringement (hereinafter "Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado"), alleges as follows:

- 1. Paragraphs 1-66 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado do not require a response, nevertheless and to the extent necessary, Plaintiff Ricoh asserts all defenses and affirmation defenses available to it, including but not limited to failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and lack of subject matter jurisdiction.
- 2. Plaintiff Ricoh admits the allegations of paragraph 67 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.
- 3. Plaintiff Ricoh admits the allegations of paragraph 68 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.
- 4. With respect to paragraph 69 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado, Ricoh admits there is a justicable controversy insofar as the counterclaims relate to claims 13-17 of the '432 Patent but denies there is a justicable controversy to the extent any of the counterclaims relate to any of the other claims of the '432 Patent and further states that the Court lacks jurisdiction with respect to such counterclaims.
- 5. Plaintiff Ricoh admits this Court has personal jurisdiction over Ricoh and otherwise denies the allegations of paragraph 70 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.
- 6. Plaintiff Ricoh admits venue is proper in this district and otherwise denies the allegations of paragraph 71 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.
- 7. Plaintiff Ricoh admits the allegations of paragraph 72 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado insofar as they relate to claims 13-17 of the '432 Patent but denies there is a justicable controversy as to any of the other claims of the '432 Patent and the Court therefore lacks jurisdiction with respect to such other claims.
- 8. In response to paragraph 73 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado; Plaintiff Ricoh incorporates its responses to paragraph 67-71 of the Answer and

5

12

14

13

16

15

1718

19

2021

22

2324

2526

27

28

Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado as if fully set forth herein denies the allegations in paragraphs 58-66 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado; and notes there are no allegations requiring response in paragraph 1-57 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado but nevertheless and to the extent necessary, admits or denies or denies information and belief sufficient to form a belief, as appropriate, as to any statements therein.

- 9. Plaintiff Ricoh admits the allegations of paragraph 74 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado, but alleges that it is the owner of the '432 Patent.
- 10. Plaintiff Ricoh admits the allegations of paragraph 75 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.
- 11. Plaintiff Ricoh denies the allegations of paragraph 76 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.
- 12. Paragraph 77 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado is not a proper allegation but rather is a prayer for relief; nevertheless and to the extent necessary, plaintiff Ricoh denies the allegations of paragraph 77 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.
- 13. In response to paragraph 78 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado, plaintiff Ricoh incorporates its responses to paragraph 67-71 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado as if fully set forth herein denies the allegations in paragraphs 58-66 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado; and notes there are no allegations requiring response in paragraph 1-57 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado but nevertheless and to the extent necessary, admits or denies or denies information and belief sufficient to form a belief, as appropriate, as to any statements therein.
- 14. Plaintiff Ricoh denies the allegations of paragraph 79 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.
- 15. Paragraph 80 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado is not a proper allegation but rather is a prayer for relief; nevertheless and to the extent necessary, plaintiff Ricoh denies the allegations of paragraph 80 of the Answer and Counterclaim of

Aeroflex Colorado.

16. Paragraph 81 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado is not a proper allegation and is not permitted under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and therefore does not require a response; nevertheless and to the extent necessary, plaintiff Ricoh denies the allegations of paragraph 81 of the Answer and Counterclaim of Aeroflex Colorado.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Ricoh prays for entry of judgment:

that Aeroflex Colorado has infringed the '432 Patent;

that Aeroflex Colorado, its agents, employees, representatives, successors, and assigns and those acting, or purporting to act, in privity or in concert with Aeroflex Colorado, be preliminarily and permanently enjoined from further infringement of the '432 Patent;

that Aeroflex Colorado account for and pay to Ricoh all damages under 35 U.S.C. § 284, including enhanced damages, caused by the infringement of the '432 Patent, and attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285;

that Ricoh be granted pre-judgment and post-judgment interest on the damages caused to it by reason of Aeroflex Colorado's infringement of the '432 Patent;

that Aeroflex Colorado's Counterclaim be dismissed with prejudice;

that costs be awarded to Ricoh; and

25

26

27

28

Case No.: C-03-4669-MJJ (EMC) Page 3

RICOH'S REPLY TO COUNTERCLAIM OF AEROFLEX COLORADO SPRINGS, INC.

TO AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

1 that Ricoh be granted such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper 2 under the current circumstances. 3 4 Dated: May 17, 2004 Respectfully submitted, Ricoh Company, Ltd. 5 6 By: /s/ Kenneth Brothers 7 Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008 8 ALTSHULER, BERZON, NUSSBAUM, 9 **RUBIN & DEMAIN** 177 Post Street, Suite 300 10 San Francisco, California 94108 Phone: (415) 421-7151 11 Fax: (415) 362-8064 12 Gary M. Hoffman 13 Kenneth W. Brothers DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & 14 OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L Street NW 15 Washington, D.C. 20037-1526 Telephone: (202) 785-9700 16 Facsimile: (202) 887-0689 17 Edward A. Meilman 18 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 19 1177 Avenue of the Americas 20 New York, New York 10036 Telephone: (212) 896-5471 21 Facsimile: (212) 997-9880 22 Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd. 23 24 25 26 27

Case No.: C-03-4669-MJJ (EMC) Page 4

28